

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as now presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23, and 32-50 have been previously canceled. Claims 30, and 31 have been canceled. Claim 24 has been amended. Claims 24-29 are active in the application.

Claim 24 has been amended to generally include the features recited in Claims 30, and 31. However, the feature of “silicon dioxide” recited in Claim 31 has not been introduced into amended Claim 24.

Claims 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Yamaguchi.

Williams was cited for teaching every feature of originally filed Claim 24. However, the Office Action does note that the one embodiment of Williams “does not teach wherein the above substrate is of silicon, the etching into substrate is implemented using photolithography techniques, and that the above film layer deposition is implemented using photolithography techniques.”

Furthermore, Williams lacks the feature of a “transparent film layer comprising at least one of silicon nitride, polysilicon, and polyimide,” as recited in amended Claim 24. Therefore, Applicants believe that the Williams reference does not in any way anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 24.

Yamaguchi was cited for the limited teaching of providing a silicon substrate carrier having a film of “silicon dioxide.” However, the Yamaguchi reference lacks the feature of a “transparent film layer comprising at least one of silicon nitride, polysilicon, and polyimide,” as recited in amended Claim 24. Therefore, Applicants believe that the Yamaguchi reference does not in any way anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 24.

Yamaguchi was cited in combination with Williams to render obvious Applicants’ invention as recited in amended Claim 24. However, the Yamaguchi reference provides no teaching to over come the shortcomings of the Williams reference. Thus, the combination of Yamaguchi and Williams is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ invention as recited in amended Claim 24.

The same arguments as above apply to Claims 25-29, which depend from amended Claim 24. Therefore, Applicants believe that Claims 25-29 define over the combination of references.

The above changes to the claims are self-evident from the original disclosure; thus, no new matter has been introduced, and no new issues have been raised.

Appl. No. 10/723,826
Amdt. dated May 11, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 7, 2004

Amendment A, continued

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are definite and in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date of Deposit: *May 11, 2004*

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service via first class mail
on the date indicated above and is addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Karl D. Kovach

By *Karl D. Kovach*
Karl D. Kovach
Reg. No.: 40,278
Stratos International, Inc.
Attorney for Applicants
7444 West Wilson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60706
(708) 867-9600